UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,583	09/27/2004	Michael BURR	2006579-0231 (CTX-093)	5582

69665   7590   01/11/2008
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
WATSON, CHARLES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4117	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 September 2004*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-60* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-60* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

2.   Claims 1 - 8, 12- 16, 17 - 29, 31 – 57 and 59 - 60 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hipp et al. US 7,146, 431 (referred to

as Hipp hereafter) in view of Willis (US 2005/0198387).

        Regarding claim 1, Hipp teaches a system for assigning a unique network

identifier to each program (e.g. application) invoked (e.g. launched) on a

computer, in which an interface mechanism (200) selecting, from the plurality of

network identifiers (e.g. addresses, column 3, lines 6-9, column 3, lines 60-

column 4, line 6), a first network identifier for a first program invoked on the

computer and selecting a second network identifier, different from the first

network identifier, for a second program invoked on the computer (column 4,

lines 6-10, chosen identifiers column 4, lines 45-54), and associating the first

network identifier with the first program and associating the second network

identifier with the second program and transmit one network identifier to a

program and another network identifier to another program (column 7, lines 1-

20). Hipp teaches that the network identifier is used in a network communication

of the respective program, e.g. the program's IP address is the IP address the

application uses for all communication (column 3, lines 2-3 for communicating

over the network column 4, lines 20-29, 41-59)

However, Hipp does not teach where the interface mechanism in

communication with the interface mechanism transmits the network identifier with

a network communication of the respective program.

Willis teaches an interface mechanism (e.g. application program interface,

031-0032) for associating a network identifier with a with program (0026, 0039),

wherein the network identifier is from a plurality of network identifier (0027);

interface mechanism transmits the network identifier with a network

communication (e.g. packet) of (e.g. to/from) the respective program (0017)

when intercepting all communication between to/from the program (0031-0032)..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Hipp and Willis. One of ordinary

skill in the art would be motivated to combine these teachings with the teachings

of Hipp because Hipp teaches a system which consist of a global address space

identifying a plurality of network identifiers (internet protocol addresses) which is

inherent in network communication that are reserved for use in one or more

network environments, wherein each environment includes one or more plurality

of IP addresses, which can be beneficial in Willis' system because Willis' system

introduces a network communication interface which is capable of allocating

addresses which will be unique to each user session, each session contains a

plurality of processes which can represent an application program, where the

computer system is connected to the network though an adapter, which can be is associated with a different user.

Regarding claim **2**, Willis teaches a system wherein the network identifier comprises an internet protocol address (paragraph 0027).

Regarding claim **3**, Willis teaches a system wherein the network identifier comprises a host name (paragraph 0026).

Regarding claim **4**, Willis teaches a system wherein one of the first program and the second program comprises a user session hosted by the computer (paragraph 0027).

Regarding claim **5**, Hipp teaches a system wherein one of the first program and the second program comprises one of an application isolation environment and an application (Abstract).

Regarding claim **6**, Willis teaches a system wherein the computer obtains at least one of the plurality of network identifiers from a server (paragraph 0027).

Regarding claim **7**, Willis teaches a system wherein the server comprises a Dynamic Host configuration Protocol server (paragraph 0027).

Regarding claim **8**, Willis teaches a system wherein the computer obtains

at least one of the plurality of network identifiers from a storage location

(paragraph 0027).

Regarding claim **10**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism (address allocator) selects the first network identifier for the first

program during an establishment of the first program (paragraph 0039)

Regarding claim **11**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism (address allocator) selects the second network identifier for the

second program during an establishment of the second program (paragraph

0039)

Regarding claim **12**, Willis teaches a system wherein the computer

concurrently hosts a first user session and a second user session (paragraph

0025 & Fig. 1).

Regarding claim **13**, Willis teaches a system wherein the computer hosts a

second user session subsequent to the hosting of a first user session (paragraph

0039 & Fig. 3).

Regarding claim **14**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism provides the first network identifier (200) of the first program in

response to a name resolution request (204) of the first program and provides

the second network identifier (200) of the second program in response to a name

resolution request (204) of the second program (paragraph 0039 &Fig. 2 & 3).

Regarding claim **15**, Willis teaches a system wherein at least one of the

plurality of network identifiers is allocated to a user of the computer (paragraph

0039).

Regarding **claim 18**, Willis teaches a system wherein the socket library

comprises a WinSock application programming interface (paragraph 0036).

Regarding claim **19**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism (address allocator) binds the first network identifier to the first

program for socket communication with the network communication interface

(paragraph 0044).

Regarding claim **20**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism (address allocator) binds the second network identifier to the second

program for socket communication with the network communication interface

(paragraph 0044).

Regarding claim **22**, Willis teaches a system wherein the interface mechanism (address allocator) comprises a network packet-manipulation filter (active filter) (paragraph 0037 & Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 31, the method claim comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable..

3.   Claim **23** and **53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis.

Regarding claim 23, Willis teaches a system wherein assigning a unique loopback address (host address) to each program invoked on a computer, the system comprises a computer obtaining a plurality of loopback addresses (host addresses) (paragraph 0039, the computer comprising:

an interface mechanism selecting (address allocator), from the plurality of loopback address, a first address for a program invoked on the computer and selecting a second loopback address, different from the first loopback address, for a second program invoked on the computer, and associating the first loopback address as a local host address of the first program and associating the second loopback address as a local host address of the second (paragraph 0027); and

a loopback interface, in communication with the interface mechanism, transmitting the first loopback address with an inter-process communication of

the first program, and transmitting the second loopback address with an inter-process communication of the second program (paragraph 0025 & 26).

Although Willis does use the term "program" he does teach that each session consists of a plurality of processes, and each of those processes does represent a application program, and in fig. 1, each computer system is capable of operating with multiple processes (0025-0026).

Willis also teaches where each process is capable of being assigned a unique host address, from a pool of addresses, with each request from each process (0027). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention that the teachings of Willis performs all function as claimed, as such is functionally equivalent to the invention as claimed.

Regarding claim 53, this method claim comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 23, same rationale of rejection is applicable..

.

Regarding claims **24, 34, and 54,** these method claim comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 4, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims **25, 35, and 55,** the method claim comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 5, same rationale of rejection is applicable..

Regarding claims **26, 40, and 59,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 10, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims **27, 41, and 60,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 11, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims **28 and 36,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 6, same rationale of rejection is applicable..

Regarding claims **29, 38, and 57,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 8, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims **32 and 33,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claims 2-3, respectively, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims **37 and 56,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 2, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim **42-52** comprise substantially the same limitations as

those discussed on claims 12-22, respectively; same rationale of rejection is

applicable.

4.   Claims **16, 17 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hipp and Willis, in view of Yu (US 5,734, 865).

Regarding claim **16**, Hipp and Willis do not teach a system wherein there

interface mechanism comprises a first TCP.

Yu teaches a system wherein the interface mechanism comprises a first

TCP stack (col. 9; line 24-29 & Fig. 1B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of the references mentioned

above. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine these teachings with

the teachings of Yu because it would be beneficial to the user due to the

properties of a TCP stack which are its ability to become pluggable components

that may be implemented with the stack of the user's choice. Various

combinations of stacks offer the optimal tradeoff between tiny size, intermediate

size and performance, and very high performance when limited resources are

available.

Regarding claim **17**, Yu teaches a system wherein the interface

mechanism comprises a socket library for communication with the network

communication interface (Fig. 1A).

Regarding claim **21**, Hipp and Willis do not teach a system wherein there

interface mechanism comprises a second TCP.

Yu teaches a system wherein the interface mechanism comprises a

second TCP stack (Col. 9; line 24-29 & Fig. 1B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of the references mentioned

above. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine these teachings with

the teachings of Yu because it would be beneficial to the user due to the

properties of a TCP stack which are its ability to become pluggable components

that may be implemented with the stack of the user's choice. Various

combinations of stacks offer the optimal tradeoff between tiny size, intermediate

size and performance, and very high performance when limited resources are

available.

5.   Claims **9, 30, 39, 58** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hipp in view of Willis, in further view of Eschbach et al (US

7,042, 879).

Regarding **claim 9**, Hipp and Willis do not teach a system wherein there is a network identifier generator.

However, Eschbach teaches a system wherein the computer obtains at least one of the plurality of network identifiers from a network identifier generator (Col. 13 ; line 10-13 & Fig. 2A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the references mentioned above. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine these teachings with the teachings of Eschbach because Eschbach teaches having a network system that includes an IP address generator. This IP address generator would extremely beneficial in Hipp and Willis invention because it would allow a user to be able to obtain network identifier for a particular session.

Regarding claims **30, 39, and 58,** these method claims comprises substantially the same step perform in the system claim 9, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Watson whose telephone number is (571) 270-3633. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached on (571) 272-3902 or beatriz.prieto@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. Watson
Patent Examiner   /Prieto, Beatriz/
                                    Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4117